

Serial No. 09/930,720  
Amdt. dated July 11, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CAS0048

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 32 through 62 remain in this application. Claims 10 through 28, 30 and 31 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 32 through 62 have been added. In essence, the claims have been reverted back to their original condition as filed August 15, 2001, such that new claims 32 through 62 correspond to original claims 1 through 31, except that independent claims 32, 41, 48 and 54 have been modified as explained below.

Claims 10 through 28, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,477,526 to Hayashi ("Hayashi patent") in view of European Publication EP 0827126A2. Claims 10 through 28, 30 and 31 are canceled and have been replaced by new claims 41 through 59, 61 and 62.

Claim 32 provides, *inter alia*, receiving a route-identifier from a user interface, wherein the route-identifier identifies a route between the first location and the second location. Claim 41 provides, *inter alia*, receiving a route-identifier from a user interface, wherein the route-identifier identifies a relationship between the starting location and the destination location. Claim 48 provides, *inter alia*, computer readable program code that receives a route-identifier from a user interface, wherein the route-identifier identifies a relationship between the first location and the second location. Claim 54 provides, *inter alia*, receiving a route-identifier from a user interface, wherein the route-identifier comprises the starting-identifier and the destination-identifier. Support for the above added recitation to claims 32, 41, 48 and 54 is provided at page 9, lines 11 through 21, of the specification.

Serial No. 09/930,720  
Amdt. dated July 11, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CAS0048

In contrast, the Hayashi patent describes a route calculation server that receives the starting point, the destination and the route calculation conditions from the WWW server and calculates, using the received information, the optimum route which satisfies the route calculation conditions designated by the user. The route calculation server then assigns an id (referred to as "route id") to the route point data sequence, and stores the route point data sequence in association with the route id before returning the route id and the route point data sequence to the WWW server (see FIG. 5; col. 9, lines 1 through 17). Therefore, the "route id" in Hayashi is a *transaction identifier assigned by the route calculation server*. On the other hand, claims 32, 41, 48 and 54 provide a route-identifier that is a "label" *received from the user via a user interface* (for example "HOME/WORK"; see page 4, lines 9 through 13). In other words, the route-identifier is part of the input rather than output by a server.

It is submitted that there's significant value in letting the user define and input a route identifier (label). It allows the user to refer to the route using the label at a later stage, as opposed to referring to a route by its end points. Such a label, as opposed to a transaction ID, would be much easier for the user to remember and input than a transaction identifier. The Hayashi patent does not describe or suggest receiving a route-identifier *from a user interface*, wherein the route-identifier identifies a relationship between the starting location and the destination location, as required by claims 32, 41, 48 and 54. Likewise, EP 0827126A2 does not describe or suggest receiving a route-identifier from a user interface, wherein the route-identifier identifies a relationship between the starting location and the destination location. Therefore, claims 32, 41,

Serial No. 09/930,720  
Amdt. dated July 11, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CAS0048

48 and 54 distinguish patentably from the Hayashi patent, EP 0827126A2, and the combination of these publications.

Claims 33 through 40, 42 through 47, 49 through 53, and 55 through 62 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 32, 41, 48 and 54. Therefore, claims 33 through 40, 42 through 47, 49 through 53, and 55 through 62 distinguish patentably from the Hayashi patent, EP 0827126A2 and the combination of these publications for the reasons stated above for claims 32, 41, 48 and 54.

In view of the above, allowance of new claims 32 through 62 is believed warranted and is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests


Serial No. 09/930,720  
Amdt. dated July 11, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of May 23, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CAS0048

that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Balasuriya, Senaka

Please forward all correspondence to:  
Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department (HDW)  
600 North US Highway 45, AS437  
Libertyville, IL 60048

 07/11/05  
Hisashi D. Watanabe Date  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 37,465  
Telephone: (847) 523-2322  
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350